## *Remarks*

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 46-70 are pending in the application, with claims 46 and 64 being the independent claims. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Double Patenting***

In the Office Action, claims 46 and 64 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 25-26 and 28-58 of copending application Serial No. 10/218,206 and claims 24-44 of copending application Serial No. 09/610,722.

A terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c) is filed herewith so as to overcome the provisional nonstatutory double patenting rejection. Accordingly, Applicants request that the double patent rejection be withdrawn and that these claims be passed to allowance.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 64 and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ellis, U.S. Patent No. 6,484,257 (Ellis). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Ellis does not teach or suggest each and every feature of amended independent claim 64. Ellis describes a system and method for maintaining multiple simultaneous

cryptographic sessions using a distributed computing environment. In Ellis, a client connects and authenticates itself to a main server. (Ellis, col. 7, lines 23-25). If the main server has insufficient resources to service the session with the client, the main server instructs one or more agent servers to wake up and participate in a multiparty key exchange between the client, main server, and agent. (Ellis, col. 7, lines 25-34). The main server notifies the client and agent server(s) of the correct cipher to use for the session and any special information such as special ciphers for the different types of communications formats. (Ellis, col. 7, lines 47-51). The client and agent independently generate a session key to exchange data and then the client begins encrypting session communications with the agent using key and information from the main server. (Ellis, col. 7, lines 53-57). Thus, in Ellis, the key and cipher information is communicated to the client and agent from the main server. Additionally, this information is communicated prior to the transmission of packets from the client to the agent.

Thus, Ellis does not teach or suggest at least the feature of "receiving at least a portion of the security association information associated with a data packet in the plurality of data packets along with the corresponding data packet at each security processing engine in a plurality of security processing engines in the device, wherein at least two of the plurality of security processing engines receive security association information for different packets in the data flow," as recited in amended independent claim 64.

For at least the above reasons, amended independent claim 64 is patentable over Ellis. Claim 65 depends from claim 64. For at least these reasons, and further in

view of its own features, dependent claim 65 is patentable over Ellis. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Ellis and Ober

Claims 46-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of Ober, et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,708,273 (Ober). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The combination of Ellis and Ober does not teach or suggest each and every feature of amended independent claim 46. For the reasons discussed above, Ellis does not teach or suggest "a plurality of security processing engines in the device, coupled to the classification module, each of the plurality of security processing engines configured to receive at least a portion of the security association information associated with a data packet in the plurality of data packets along with the corresponding data packet, wherein at least two of the plurality of security processing engines receive security association information for different packets," as recited in amended independent claim 46.

Ober does not overcome these deficiencies of Ellis. Ober describes a cryptographic co-processor having an encryption circuit 36 and a hash circuit 30. (Ober, col. 5, lines 26-40; FIG. 1). As discussed in Ober, "[f]or Hash-then-Encrypt and Hash-then-Decrypt operations, the CryptIC can perform parallel execution of both functions from the same source and destination buffers." (Ober, col. 10, lines 35-38). In Ober, "[o]nce a crypto-context has been loaded, and the operation defined, data is processed by writing it to a data input FIFO. At the I/O interface, data is

always written to, or read from, the same address. Internally, the hash and encryptions functions have separate 512-bit FIFOs 108, 116, each with their own FIFO management pointers. Incoming data is automatically routed to one or both of these FIFOs 108, 116 depending on the operation in progress." (Ober, col. 38, lines 26-33; FIG. 9). Thus, in Ober, the encryption circuit and hash circuit operate on the same data packet and share the same context information.

Accordingly, Ober also does not teach or suggest "a plurality of security processing engines in the device, coupled to the classification module, each of the plurality of security processing engines configured to receive at least a portion of the security association information associated with a data packet in the plurality of data packets along with the corresponding data packet, wherein at least two of the plurality of security processing engines receive security association information for different packets," as recited in amended independent claim 46.

For at least the above reasons, amended independent claim 46 is patentable over the combination of Ellis and Ober. Claims 47-63 depend from claim 46. For at least the above reasons, and further in view of their own features, dependent claims 47-63 are patentable over the combination of Ellis and Ober. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

Ellis and Leung

Claims 66-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view Leung, U.S. Patent No. 6,760,444 (Leung). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 66-70 depend from claim 65. Leung does not overcome the deficiencies of the Ellis relative to amended independent claim 65. For at least these reasons, and further in view of their own features, dependent claims 66-70 are patentable over the combination of Ellis and Leung. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

## *Conclusion*

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Lori A. Gordon
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 50,633

Date: October 30, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

707142_1.DOC